arXiv:1412.2375v1 [math.AP] 7 Dec 2014

NEAR SOLITON DYNAMICS AND SINGULARITY FORMATION FOR L^2 CRITICAL PROBLEMS

YVAN MARTEL, FRANK MERLE, PIERRE RAPHAËL, AND JÉRÉMIE SZEFTEL

Abstract. This survey reviews the state of the art concerning the singularity formation for two canonical dispersive problems: the mass critical non linear Schrödinger equation and the mass critical generalized KdV equation. In particular, we address the question of the classification of the flow for initial data near the soliton.

1. Introduction

The study of singularity formation in nonlinear dispersive equations has attracted considerable attention for the past thirty years. Recently, this activity has led to the development of robust tools to construct and describe blow up solutions, solving some of the classical conjectures in the field. Description of blow up solutions typically includes determination of blow up speed, blow-up profile, behavior of concentration points. We start by introducing below the two main equations to be considered in this review.

1.1. The L^2 critical (NLS) and (gKdV) problems.

Our aim in these notes is to review some recent progress done in the past ten years on singularity formation for two canonical problems: the L^2 critical non linear Schrödinger equation

$$\text{(NLS)} \qquad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u + u|u|^{\frac{4}{d}} = 0 \\ u_{|t=0} = u_0 \end{cases} \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d, \quad u \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{1}$$

and the L^2 critical (one dimensional) generalized Korteweg–de Vries equation

$$\text{(gKdV)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u_{xx} + u^5)_x = 0 \\ u_{|t=0} = u_0 \end{cases} \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2}$$

A specific algebra underlies these two models. Solutions of both models preserve the so–called energy

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{2+\frac{4}{d}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{2+\frac{4}{d}} = E(u_0)$$

and the mass

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_0|^2$$

(take $d = 1$ in both expressions in the case of gKdV). The notion of L^2 criticality means that the scaling symmetry of the equation:

$$\text{if } u(t,x) \text{ is solution then } u_\lambda(t,x) := \begin{cases} \lambda^{\frac{d}{2}} u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x) \text{ for (NLS)} \\ \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} u(\lambda^3 t, \lambda x) \text{ for (gKdV)} \end{cases} \text{ is also solution,}$$

leaves the L^2 norm unchanged.

1.2. **Local existence theory and blow up.** From Ginibre and Velo [17], (1) is locally well-posed in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and from Kenig, Ponce and Vega [23], (2) is locally well-posed in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Thus, for any $u_0 \in H^1$, there exists $0 < T \leq +\infty$ and a unique maximal solution $u(t) \in \mathcal{C}([0,T), H^1)$ to either (1) or (2), with the following alternative:

- either $T = +\infty$, the solution is globally defined in H^1;
- or $T < +\infty$ and then the solution blows up in finite time:

$$\lim_{t \uparrow T} \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} = +\infty.$$

1.3. **Ground state and sharp threshold for global existence.** Exceptional solutions propagating without deformation (called traveling waves, or solitons) play a distinguished role in the analysis. Indeed, the ansatz

$$u(t,x) = \begin{cases} Q(x)e^{it} & \text{for (NLS)} \\ Q(x-t) & \text{for (gKdV)} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

leads to the semi linear elliptic problem

$$\Delta Q - Q + Q^{1+\frac{4}{d}} = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which admits a unique up to space translation, positive, H^1 solution known as the ground state solitary wave. Explicit variational characterization of Q related to sharp Sobolev bounds led in the 80's to the first derivation of a sharp criterion of global existence versus blow up for (NLS) by Weinstein [70] and Berestycki, Cazenave [3]. In particular, H^1 initial data with

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$$

for both (NLS) and (gKdV) generate a unique global solution $u \in \mathcal{C}([0,+\infty, H^1)$. In the case of (NLS), it is moreover known in this case that the solution scatters, i.e. behaves like a free wave as $t \to +\infty$:

$$\exists u_{\pm\infty} \in H^1 \text{ such that } \lim_{t \to \pm\infty} \|u(t) - e^{it\Delta} u_{\pm\infty}\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

We refer to [8] and to the recent definitive result [9] (see also references therein). In other words, the ground state solitary wave is the *smallest non dispersive and thus non linear object.*

In many nonlinear problems, solitary waves are expected to be the building blocks for nonlinear dynamics: for large time any solution decomposes into a certain number of solitary waves plus a residual which is a free wave. This fact is well-known for integrable problems from the 60's, at least at the formal level. In blow up regimes, the role played by solitary waves has also been clarified in several directions: Q is the universal blow up profile for blow up solutions initially close to Q, independently of the blow up speed. It is thus a fundamental object to study the formation of singularity in such situations. Moreover, the complete description of the non linear flow near the ground state solitary wave has become one of the most relevant and challenging question in the field.

Theses notes are organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize results on blow up solutions near Q obtained for (NLS) in [46], [47], [48], [50], [53], [66]. In Section 3, we discuss for (gKdV) the description of the flow near the ground state obtained in [39], [40], [41]. Finally, an overview of some proofs for (gKdV) are given in Section 4.

2. The L^2 critical (NLS) problem

In this section, we review the state of the art on the problem of formation of singularities for the L^2 critical (NLS), and present some other results on related problems.

2.1. **Minimal mass blow up.** As discussed in the Introduction, initial data $u_0 \in H^1$ with mass $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$ generate global bounded solutions. For (NLS), this criterion is sharp, as a consequence of the so–called pseudo conformal transformation which is a well-known symmetry of the linear Schrödinger flow and of (NLS) in the L^2 critical case: if $u(t,x)$ is a solution to (NLS), then so is

$$v(t,x) = \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{d}{2}}} u\left(-\frac{1}{t}, \frac{x}{t}\right) e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t}}. \tag{4}$$

Applied to the solitary wave solution $u(t,x) = Q(x)e^{it}$, one gets an *explicit minimal mass blow up solution*:

$$S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t,x) = \frac{1}{|t|^{\frac{d}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) e^{i\frac{|x|^2}{4t} - \frac{i}{t}}, \qquad \|S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}. \tag{5}$$

The dynamics generated by the smooth data $S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(-1)$ is explicit: $S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)$ scatters as $t \to -\infty$, and blows up as $t \uparrow 0$ at the speed

$$\|\nabla S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{|t|}. \tag{6}$$

An essential feature of (5) is that $S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)$ is *compact* up to the symmetries of the flow, meaning that all the mass goes into the singularity formation

$$|S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)|^2 \rightharpoonup \|Q\|_{L^2}^2 \delta_{x=0} \quad \text{as} \quad t \uparrow 0. \tag{7}$$

The general intuition is that such a behavior is exceptional in the sense that such minimal elements can be classified[1]. The first result of this type was proved by Merle using the pseudo conformal symmetry.

Theorem 1 (Classification of the minimal mass blow up solution, [42])**.** *Let $u_0 \in H^1$ with*

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}.$$

Assume that the corresponding solution to (NLS) blows up in finite time $0 < T < +\infty$. Then

$$u(t) = S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)$$

up to the symmetries of (NLS).

The question of existence of minimal elements in various other settings has been a long standing open problem, mostly due to the fact that the existence of the minimal element for (NLS) relies entirely on the exceptional pseudo conformal symmetry. Merle in [43] considered the inhomogeneous problem

$$i\partial_t u + \Delta u + k(x)u|u|^2 = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \tag{8}$$

which breaks the full symmetry group, and obtains for non smooth k *non existence* results of minimal elements. A contrario and more recently, a sharp criterion on the inhomogeneity $k(x)$ for the existence and uniqueness of minimal solutions is derived in [66] (see also [1] concerning existence).

[1]This is a dispersive intuition which for example is wrong in the parabolic setting, [4].

Theorem 2 (Existence and uniqueness of a critical element for (8), [66]). *Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with*

$$k(x_0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2 k(x_0) < 0.$$

Let the energy E_0 of u satisfy:

$$E_0 + \frac{1}{8} \int \nabla^2 k(x_0)(y,y) Q^4 > 0. \tag{9}$$

Then, there exists a critical mass H^1 blow up solution to (8), unique up to phase shift, which blows up at time $T = 0$ and at the point x_0 with energy E_0. Moreover,

$$\lim_{t \to 0} Im \left(\int \nabla u \overline{u} \right) = 0. \tag{10}$$

Under condition (9), minimal blow up elements at a non degenerate blow up point are thus completely classified. It is also shown in [66] that (9) is a necessary condition for blow-up. Theorem 2 relies on a dynamical construction and new Lyapunov functionals at the minimal mass level. A further extension to non local dispersion

$$i\partial_t u - (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} u + u|u|^2 = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

can be found in [27], see also [5] for an extension to curved backgrounds. These works show that the existence of a minimal mass bubble is a general property, independent of the exceptional existence of a pseudo conformal symmetry for the model.

2.2. **log-log blow up.** The minimal mass blow up solution (5) is explicit, but obviously the corresponding blow up scenario is unstable since any subcritical mass perturbation of $S_{\rm NLS}(t)$ leads to a globally defined solution. The question of the description of *stable* blow up bubbles has attracted a considerable attention which started in the 80's with the development of sharp numerical methods and the prediction of the "log-log law" for NLS by Landman, Papanicoalou, Sulem, Sulem [32].

We focus our attention to initial data with mass slightly above the minimal mass required for singularity formation

$$u_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*} = \left\{ u_0 \in H^1 \ \text{ with } \ \|Q\|_{L^2} < \|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2} + \alpha^* \right\}, \quad 0 < \alpha^* \ll 1. \tag{11}$$

Applying concentration-compactness techniques [33] and using the variational characterization of the ground state, assumption (11) implies that if $u(t)$ blows up at $T < +\infty$, then for t close to T, the solution admits a nonlinear decomposition

$$u(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{d}{2}}} (Q + \varepsilon) \left(t, \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)} \right) e^{i\gamma(t)}, \tag{12}$$

where

$$\lambda(t) \sim \frac{1}{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}}, \quad \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta(\alpha^*), \quad \lim_{\alpha^* \to 0} \delta(\alpha_*) = 0. \tag{13}$$

This decomposition implies that independently of the blow up regime, the ground state solitary wave Q is a good approximation of the blow up profile, which is the starting point of a perturbative analysis for (11). *The sharp description of the blow up bubble now relies on the determination of a finite dimensional dynamical system for a suitable choice of geometrical parameters $(\lambda(t), x(t), \gamma(t))$, coupled to the infinite dimensional dynamics driving the residual term $\varepsilon(t)$.*

Remark 3. For example, one can decompose the minimal mass blow up solution (5) as follows:

$$\lambda(t)=|t|,\quad \varepsilon(t,y)=Q(y)\left(e^{i\frac{b(t)|y|^2}{4}}-1\right),\quad b(t)=|t|.$$

All possible regimes for $(\lambda(t),x(t),\gamma(t))$ are not known so far for (NLS), but progress has been made on the understanding of both "stable" and "threshold" dynamics. The following theorem summarizes a series of results obtained in [48], [46], [47], [50], [49], [59]:

Theorem 4 ([48], [46], [47], [50], [49], [59])**.** *Let $d\le 5$. There exists a universal constant $\alpha^*>0$ such that the following holds true. Let $u_0\in\mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*}$ and $u\in\mathcal{C}([0,T),H^1)$, $0<T\le+\infty$ be the corresponding maximal solution to* (1).
(i) Sharp L^2 concentration: *Assume $T<+\infty$. Then there exist parameters $(\lambda(t),x(t),\gamma(t))\in\mathcal{C}^1([0,T),\mathbb{R}_+^*\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R})$ and an asymptotic profile $u^*\in L^2$ such that*

$$u(t)-\frac{1}{\lambda(t)^{\frac{d}{2}}}Q\left(\frac{x-x(t)}{\lambda(t)}\right)e^{i\gamma(t)}\to u^*\quad in\quad L^2\quad as\quad t\to T. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the blow up point is finite:

$$x(t)\to x(T)\in\mathbb{R}^d\quad as\quad t\to T.$$

(ii) Blow up speed: *Under* (i)*, the following alternative holds:*
- either the solution satisfies the log-log regime*, i.e.*

$$\lambda(t)\sqrt{\frac{\log|\log(T-t)|}{T-t}}\to\sqrt{2\pi}\quad as\quad t\to T \tag{15}$$

and then the asymptotic profile is not smooth:

$$u^*\notin H^1\quad and\quad u^*\notin L^p\quad for\ all\quad p>2; \tag{16}$$

- or there holds the sharp lower bound, for t close to T,

$$\lambda(t)\le C(u_0)(T-t),\quad equivalently\quad \|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}\ge\frac{C_1(u_0)}{T-t} \tag{17}$$

and then the asymptotic profile satisfies

$$u^*\in H^1. \tag{18}$$

(iii) Sufficient condition for log-log blow up: *Assume $E_0\le 0$. Then the solution blows un finite time $T<+\infty$ in the log-log regime* (15).
(iv) H^1 stability of the log-log blow up: *The set of initial data in $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*}$ such that the corresponding solution to (1) blows up in finite time with the log-log law (15) is open in H^1.*

Comments on the result.

1. The log-log law. The stable blow log-log law (15) was proposed in the pioneering formal and numerical work [32]. The first rigorous construction of a class of solutions with such blow up speed is due to G. Perelman [58] in dimension $d=1$. The proof of Theorem 4 involves a mild coercivity property of the linearized operator close to Q, which is proved in dimension $d=1$ in [48] and checked numerically in an elementary way in [15] for $d\le 5$. For dimensions $d\ge 2$, the lack of explicit formula for the ground state is a difficulty to prove this property.

2. Upper bound on the blow up speed: No general upper bound on the blow up speed $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}$ is known in the L^2 critical case, even for data $u_0\in\mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*}$. This is in contrast with super critical regimes where recently a sharp upper bound has been derived (see [54] and

section 2.5.3). The lower bound (17) is sharp and attained by the minimal blow up element $S_{\rm NLS}(t)$. The derivation of different blow up speeds, which is equivalent to the construction of infinite time grow up solutions through the pseudo conformal symmetry, is related to the description of the flow near the ground state, still incomplete for (NLS). Some intuition may come from the recent classification results obtained for the L^2 critical gKdV problem and presented in section 3.

3. Quantization of the blow up mass: The strong convergence (14) describes precisely the blow up bubble in the scaling invariant space and implies in particular that the mass put into the singularity is quantized

$$|u(t)|^2 \rightharpoonup \|Q\|_{L^2}^2 \delta_{x=x(T)} + |u^*|^2 \quad \text{as} \quad t \to T, \quad |u^*|^2 \in L^1.$$

Such quantization and the convergence result (14) rely on the property of asymptotic stability of the solitary wave in blow up regime, which writes as follows in the formulation (12)

$$\varepsilon(t,x) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad t \to T \quad \text{in} \quad L^2_{\rm loc}.$$

In fact, in proving Theorem 4, the derivation of either upper bounds or lower bounds on the blow up rate is closely related to the question of dispersion for the residual $\varepsilon(t,x)$. Such asymptotic theorems started to appear in the dispersive setting in [36], and significant progress was made in a recent classification result - without any assumption of size on the data - for energy critical wave equations [11].

4. Asymptotic profile: The regularity of the asymptotic profile u^* depends directly upon the regime because singular and regular parts of the solution are very much coupled in the stable log-log regime, while they are weakly interacting in any other regime.

2.3. **Threshold dynamics.** Theorem 4 describes the stable log-log blow up in the neighborhood of the soliton, but it does not complete the study of blow up for (NLS) even for initial data $u_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*}$. In particular, it remains to clarify unstable blow up close to Q. The explicit minimal mass blow up solution $S_{\rm NLS}(t)$ defined in (4) is clearly unstable but Bourgain and Wang [6] observed that specific perturbations of the initial data preserve blow up with speed $1/t$. The excess of mass in this regime converts into a *flat and smooth* asymptotic profile at the blow up time, which does not alter the blow up law.

Theorem 5 (Bourgain-Wang solutions [6])**.** *Let $d = 1, 2$. Let u^* be such that*

$$u^* \in X_A = \{f \in H^A \text{ with } (1+|x|^A) f \in L^2\}, \tag{19}$$

and

$$D^\alpha u^*(0) = 0, \text{ for } 1 \le |\alpha| \le A, \tag{20}$$

for some A large enough. Then, there exists a solution $u_{BW} \in \mathcal{C}((-\infty,0), H^1)$ to (1) which blows up at $t = 0$, $x = 0$ and satisfies:

$$u_{BW}(t) - S_{\rm NLS}(t) \to u^* \quad \text{in} \quad H^1 \quad \text{as} \quad t \uparrow 0. \tag{21}$$

We refer to [6] for a more precise statement and to [29] for a further discussion on the construction of a manifold of Bourgain-Wang solutions. Note that the Bourgain-Wang blow up solutions saturate the lower bound (17):

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{T-t}.$$

Recall that by Strichartz estimates and L^2 critical Cauchy theory [7], solutions which scatter are L^2 stable. Also, from Theorem 4, solutions in $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha^*}$ that blow up in finite time in the log-log regime form an open set in H^1. Bourgain-Wang solutions correspond in a certain sense to a threshold unstable dynamic between these two stable dynamics, as was proved in [53].

Theorem 6 (Instability of Bourgain-Wang solutions, [53]). *Let $d = 2$. Let u^* satisfy (19) and (20) and let $u_{BW} \in \mathcal{C}((-\infty, 0), H^1)$ be the corresponding Bourgain-Wang solution. Then there exists a continuous map*

$$\eta \in [-1, 1] \to u^\eta(-1) \in \Sigma = \{f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ with } xf \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$$

such that, $u^\eta(t)$ being the solution of (1) with initial data $u^\eta(-1)$ at $t = -1$,

- *$u^{\eta=0}(t) \equiv u_{BW}(t)$;*
- *$\forall \eta \in (0, 1]$, $u^\eta \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}, \Sigma)$ is global in time and scatters;*
- *$\forall \eta \in [-1, 0)$, $u^\eta \in \mathcal{C}((-\infty, T^\eta), \Sigma)$ blows up in the log-log regime at $-1 < T^\eta < 0$.*

Note that this theorem only describes the flow near the Bourgain-Wang solution along *one* instability direction. A main open problem for (NLS) is to completely describe the flow near the ground state Q. Theorem 6 is a first step towards the description of the flow near Bourgain-Wang solutions, which is an interesting open problem (see section 2.7 and [29]).

2.4. **Structural instability of the log-log law.** The Zakharov system in space dimensions $d = 2, 3$, is a model related to (NLS) with fundamental physical relevance [69]:

$$\text{(Zakharov)} \qquad \begin{cases} iu_t = -\Delta u + nu, \\ \frac{1}{c_0^2} n_{tt} = \Delta n + \Delta |u|^2, \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

for some fixed constant $0 < c_0 < +\infty$. In the limit $c_0 \to +\infty$, one formally recovers (NLS). In dimension $d = 2$, this system displays a variational structure like the one of (NLS), even though the scaling symmetry is destroyed by the wave coupling. By bifurcation from $S_{\text{NLS}}(t)$, the exact solution of (NLS), Glangetas, Merle [18] constructed a one parameter family of blow up solutions with blow up speed:

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{C(u_0)}{T - t}.$$

Numerical experiments (Papanicolaou, Sulem, Sulem, Wang, [57]) suggest that such solutions are stable. Recall also that from Merle [44], *all finite time blow up solutions to (22) satisfy the lower bound*

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \geq \frac{C(u_0)}{T - t}.$$

In particular, there are no log-log blow up solutions for (22), which means that in some sense Zakharov blow up dynamic should be more stable than its asymptotic limit (NLS). This is one more hint that the stable log-log law for (NLS) deeply relies on some specific algebraic structure of (NLS), as suggested by the use of non linear degeneracy properties in the blow up analysis of Theorem 4. We emphasize that refined study of the singularity formation for the Zakharov system is mostly open, though it can be considered as the first step towards the understanding of relevant and more complicated systems related to Maxwell equations.

2.5. **Blow up for the L^2 supercritical (NLS) model.** Consider the L^2 supercritical (NLS) model

$$\text{(NLS)} \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u + u|u|^{p-1} = 0 \\ u_{|t=0} = u_0 \end{cases} \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{23}$$

with the choice

$$p > 1 + \frac{4}{d}.$$

The scaling symmetry for (23) is given by

$$u_\lambda(t,x) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{p-1}} u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x),$$

and the homogeneous Sobolev space invariant under this symmetry is $\dot{H}^{s_c}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where

$$s_c = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{2}{p-1},$$

and $s_c > 0$ corresponds to the L^2 supercritical case. The problem is said energy subcritical if $s_c < 1$, energy critical if $s_c = 1$, and energy supercritical if $s_c > 1$. We now briefly describe three results for the L^2 supercritical NLS obtained by extending some techniques developed for the results reviewed above, thus illustrating their robustness.

2.5.1. *Standing ring solutions.* We consider in this section the quintic NLS, i.e $p = 5$ in (23), which is L^2 critical in dimension $d = 1$ and L^2 supercritical in dimensions $d \geq 2$. Radially symmetric solutions blowing up on a (nontrivial) sphere are constructed in [60] for dimension $d = 2$, and in [65] for the dimensions $d \geq 3$. Note that this covers energy subcritical ($d = 2$), energy critical ($d = 3$) and energy supercritical ($d \geq 4$) cases. Heuristically, in radial variables, the problem becomes:

$$i\partial_t u + \partial_r^2 u + \frac{N-1}{r}\partial_r u + u|u|^4 = 0;$$

one expects that if the singularity formation occurs on the unit sphere, then close to the singularity

$$\left|\frac{\partial_r u}{r}\right| \sim |\partial_r u| << \left|\partial_r^2 u\right|,$$

so that the leading order blow up dynamics should be given by the one dimensional quintic NLS. Therefore, solutions blowing up on a sphere in any dimension $d \geq 2$ can be constructed by perturbation of the log-log dynamic for the L^2 critical one dimensional (NLS).

See further extensions in [20], [21], [72], where axially symmetric blow up solutions are constructed for the cubic NLS.

2.5.2. *Self similar solutions.* In the L^2 supercritical case, the so-called self similar regime, i.e. blow up of the type

$$\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{1}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{p-1}+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{d}{4}}} \quad \text{as } t \sim T, \tag{24}$$

is conjectured to be the stable blow up regime, in particular in view of numerical computations (see for example [69]). In [52], this conjecture is actually proved in the "slightly" L^2 supercritical case. More precisely, considering the focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations (23) with $p > 1 + \frac{4}{d}$ sufficiently close to $1 + \frac{4}{d}$, existence and stability in H^1 of self similar finite time blow up dynamics is proved together with a qualitative description of the singularity formation near the blow up time. The analysis is perturbative of the log-log analysis of the L^2 critical case reviewed in section 2.2.

2.5.3. *Collapsing ring solutions.* For (NLS) equation (23) with $d \geq 2$ and p in the range

$$1 + \frac{4}{d} < p < \min\left(\frac{d+2}{d-2}, 5\right),$$

it is proved in [54] that any radially symmetric solution $u(t)$ blowing up at time T satisfies the following universal upper bound

$$\int_t^T (T-\tau)\|\nabla u(\tau)\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \leq C(u_0)(T-t)^{\frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}}, \tag{25}$$

where α is given by

$$\alpha = \frac{5-p}{(p-1)(N-1)}.$$

The upper bound (25) is proved to be sharp since it is actually achieved by a family of collapsing ring blow up solutions whose existence was first formally predicted in [16]. The construction of ring solutions in [54] relies on a robust strategy to build *minimal blow up elements* developed in [66]. In particular, it is a *non dispersive* solution, i.e. a solution that concentrates all its L^2 mass at the origin as t converges to the blow-up time.

2.6. **Energy critical problems.** Energy critical problems have also recently attracted considerable attention, in particular wave maps, Schrödinger maps and the harmonic heat flow:

(Wave Map) $\partial_{tt}u - \Delta u = (|\nabla u|^2 - |\partial_t u|^2)u$
(Schrödinger map) $u \wedge \partial_t u = \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 u$ $\qquad (t,x) = \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^2,\ u(t,x) \in \mathbb{S}^2.$
(Harmonic Heat Flow) $\partial_t u = \Delta u + |\nabla u|^2 u$

These problems exhibit ground state stationary solutions which are minimizers of the associated energy. This energy is also left invariant by the scaling symmetry of the problem. The long standing question of existence of blow up solutions is solved in [30], [67], [62] for the wave map problem and in [51] for the Schrödinger map problem. New types of dynamics, including ground state-like behavior or infinite time blow up, are obtained in [28], [10] for the related semi linear wave equation. For the harmonic heat flow, the full sequence of stable and unstable blow up regimes is obtained in the two papers [63, 64], which shades some new light on the structure of the flow near the ground state. These works provide a better understanding of the blow up scenario by the determination of explicit regimes, but the full description of the flow, even for initial data close to the ground state, is far from being complete. Another series of works [11], [12], aims at classifying all possible behaviors of the solutions, in particular solving the so-called "soliton resolution conjecture" for the energy critical focusing non linear wave equation in dimension 3.

2.7. **Open problems.** Here is a (non exhaustive) list of interesting open questions concerning the description of the flow near the ground state solitary wave for the L^2 critical (NLS).

(1) Does the set of initial data corresponding to Bourgain-Wang solutions form a codimension 1 manifold? This is clearly suggested by [53] and [29].
(2) In [59], it is shown that for initial data close to the ground state in the energy space, a blow up solution either follows the log-log regime, or blows up at least as fast as the conformal blow up speed (see section 2.2). Do there exist blow up solutions in H^1 such that the corresponding blow up speed is strictly faster than the conformal one? Another related question in this context concerns the existence of a general upper bound on the blow-up speed.

(3) Can one obtain a complete classification of the flow near the solitary wave in the spirit of the recent results for L^2 critical gKdV in [39], [40], [41] (see section 3)?

3. The L^2 critical (gKdV) problem

We now summarize the state of the art for the L^2 critical (gKdV) problem (2), and in particular recent results obtained in [39], [40], [41]. The gKdV model is one dimensional and we consider Q the unique (up to translation) H^1 explicit solution of $Q'' + Q^5 = Q$, i.e. $Q(x) = 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \cosh^{-\frac{1}{2}}(2x)$.

3.1. **Existence of blow up solutions.** As discussed in the Introduction, the local H^1 Cauchy theory of Kenig, Ponce and Vega [23] combined with Weinstein's variational characterization of the ground state [70], ensure that H^1 initial data with subcritical mass $\|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2}$ yield global in time H^1 solutions. Scattering is known only for small (no control) L^2 data [24]. One motivation to address this model lies on its similarities with (NLS) but without the specific structure of the (NLS) problem, in particular the pseudo conformal symmetry. Note that recent progresses on critical (NLS), (gKdV) and other nonlinear dispersive models have be obtained in synergy, any new result or technique on one model being source of inspiration for the others.

The study of singularity formation for H^1 initial data with mass close to the minimal mass

$$\|Q\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} < \|Q\|_{L^2} + \alpha^* \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha^* \ll 1, \tag{26}$$

has been initiated in the series of works [34, 35, 45, 36, 38, 37]. As for (NLS), variational constraints imply that under (26), if the solution blows up in finite time $T < +\infty$, then it admits near the blow up time a decomposition of the form

$$u(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)}(Q+\varepsilon)\left(t, \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \|\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta(\alpha^*), \tag{27}$$

where $\lim_{\alpha^* \to 0} \delta(\alpha^*) = 0$. Therefore, as for (NLS), the problem reduces to undertand the coupling between the finite dimensional dynamics governing the solitary wave part, here $(\lambda(t), x(t))$, and the residual part $\varepsilon(t)$. Two new tools were introduced in [34, 45, 36, 37] for (gKdV), which later were extended to (NLS):

- monotonicity formula and localized virial identities on ε;
- Liouville type theorems to classify asymptotic solutions.

The classical conjecture of existence of blow up dynamics was solved in [45, 37]. The original proof in [45] is indirect and based on a classification argument [34]. Basic information on the blow up structure was obtained in [36], in particular the asymptotic stability of Q as a blow up profile, i.e.

$$\varepsilon(t) \to 0 \text{ in } \ L^2_{\text{loc}} \ \text{ as } \ t \to T.$$

Under the further assumption

$$\int_{x'>x} u_0^2(x')dx' < \frac{C}{x^6} \ \text{ for } \ x > 0, \tag{28}$$

the first result of finite time blow up for negative energy solutions satisfying (11) is proved in [37], together with a partial result concerning the blow up rate:

$$\|\nabla u(t_n)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \frac{C_u}{T-t_n}, \quad \text{for subsequence } t_n \to T.$$

We will see below that a decay assumption of the type (28) is indeed necessary for finite time blow up. Finally, it is shown in [38] that H^1 solutions with minimal mass $\|u_0\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}$ and decay to the right (28), are global in time ($t \geq 0$), which rules out the possibility of minimal mass blow up under assumption (28).

3.2. **Blow up description and classification of the flow near the ground state.** We now summarize a series of more recent works [39], [40], [41] which give a complete description of the flow near the ground state, thus completing [34, 35, 45, 36, 37, 38]. With respect to these earlier works, improved results involve techniques developed for the study of (NLS) [48, 46, 47, 50, 49, 59] and energy critical geometrical problems [62, 51, 63].

Consider the following set of initial data

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ u_0 = Q + \varepsilon_0 \text{ with } \|\varepsilon_0\|_{H^1} < \alpha_0 \text{ and } \int_{y>0} y^{10}\varepsilon_0^2 < 1 \right\} \text{ for } \alpha_0 > 0 \text{ small.}$$

To consider initial data with decay on the right, instead of data simply in the energy space, is necessary for the (gKdV) equation – see Theorem 10 below. Despite many analogies between the two problems, it is a fundamental difference with respect to (NLS) analysis.

Theorem 7 (Blow up for nonpositive energy solutions in $\mathcal{A}$, [39])**.** *Let $0 < \alpha_0 \ll 1$. Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. If $E(u_0) \leq 0$ and u_0 is not a soliton, then $u(t)$ blows up in finite time T and there exists $\ell_0 = \ell_0(u_0) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} = \frac{\|Q'\|_{L^2} + o(1)}{\ell_0(T-t)} \quad \text{as } t \to T. \tag{29}$$

Moreover, there exist $\lambda(t)$, $x(t)$ and $u^* \in H^1$, $u^* \neq 0$, such that

$$u(t,x) - \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)} Q\left(\frac{x-x(t)}{\lambda(t)}\right) \to u^* \quad \text{in } L^2 \quad \text{as } t \to T, \tag{30}$$

$$\lambda(t) = (\ell_0 + o(1))(T-t), \quad x(t) = \left(\frac{1}{\ell_0^2} + o(1)\right) \frac{1}{(T-t)} \quad \text{as } t \to T, \tag{31}$$

Comments on Theorem 7

1. Blow up speed and stable blow up. An important feature of Theorem 7 is the derivation of the blow up speed for $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ with non positive energy:

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{C(u_0)}{T-t} \tag{32}$$

which implies in particular that $x(t) \to +\infty$ as $t \to T$. The concentrating soliton and the remainder term u^* thus split spatially. Observe that the blow up speed is far above the scaling blow up law which would be for (gKdV): $\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \sim c(T-t)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ (see [51], [63] for a similar gap phenomenon in energy critical geometrical problems).
To complement Theorem 1, one knows that the set of initial data in $\mathcal{A}$ which led to the blow

up (29)–(31) is open in the H^1 topology (see [39]). Thus, $(T-t)^{-1}$ is the *stable blow up* behavior for (gKdV), which is in contrast with (NLS).

2. Decay assumption on the right. Let us stress the importance of the decay assumption on the right in space for the initial data, which was already fundamental in the earlier works [37], [38]. Indeed, in contrast with the NLS equation, the universal dynamics can not be seen in H^1 and an additional assumption of decay to the right is required (see Theorem 10 below). Note however, that we do not claim sharpness in the weight y^{10} in Theorem 7.

3. Dynamical characterization of Q: Recall from the variational characterization of Q that $E(u_0) \leq 0$ implies $\|u_0\|_{L^2} > \|Q\|_{L^2}$, unless $u_0 \equiv Q$ up to scaling and translation symmetries. Theorem 7 therefore recovers the dynamical classification of Q as the unique global zero energy solution in $\mathcal{A}$, like for the mass critical (NLS), see [50].

A key to the complete description of the flow around Q is the minimal mass case, solved by the following result.

Theorem 8 (Existence and uniqueness of the minimal mass blow up element, [40])**.**
(i) Existence. *There exists a solution $S_{\rm KdV}(t) \in \mathcal{C}((0,+\infty), H^1)$ of (2) with minimal mass*

$$\|S_{\rm KdV}(t)\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}$$

which blows up backward at the origin:

$$\|S_{\rm KdV}(t)\|_{H^1} = \frac{\|Q'\|_{L^2} + o(1)}{t} \quad as \quad t \downarrow 0, \tag{33}$$

$$S_{\rm KdV}(t,x) - \frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{x + \frac{1}{t} + \overline{c}t}{t}\right) \to 0 \quad in \quad L^2 \quad as \quad t \downarrow 0$$

where $\overline{c}$ is a universal constant.
(ii) Uniqueness. *Let $u_0 \in H^1$ with $\|u_0\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}$ and assume that the corresponding solution $u(t)$ to (2) blows up in finite time. Then*

$$u \equiv S_{\rm KdV}$$

up to the symmetries of the flow.

For critical (gKdV), one recovers both the existence of a minimal mass solution, completely analoguous to $S_{\rm NLS}(t)$, and the analogue of Merle's classification result for (NLS), i.e. Theorem 1. In the absence of pseudo conformal symmetry, the uniqueness part of the proof of Theorem 8 is completely dynamical and closely related to the analysis of the inhomogeneous NLS model in [66]. The existence part is related to the universality of "the exit regime", see Theorem 9 below and Section 4 for a sketch of proof.

Observe that $S_{\rm KdV}(t)$ blows up with the same speed as the stable blow of Theorem 7. However, the minimal mass blow up is by essence unstable by perturbation since for example initial data $S_\varepsilon(-1) = (1-\varepsilon) S_{\rm KdV}(-1)$, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, have subcritical mass and thus lead to global and bounded solutions.

We now recall the main result from [39, 40], which classifies the flow for initial data in $\mathcal{A}$. Define the L^2 modulated tube around the soliton manifold:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} = \left\{ u \in H^1 \ \text{ with } \inf_{\lambda_0 > 0,\ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| u - \frac{1}{\lambda_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} Q\left(\frac{\cdot - x_0}{\lambda_0}\right) \right\|_{L^2} < \alpha^* \right\}. \tag{34}$$

Here α_0, α^* are universal constants related as follows

$$0 < \alpha_0 \ll \alpha^* \ll 1. \tag{35}$$

Theorem 9 (Rigidity of the dynamics in $\mathcal{A}$, [39, 40]). *For $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, only three scenarios are possible:*

(Blow up) *For all $t \in [0,T)$, $u(t) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}$ and the solution blows up in finite time $T < +\infty$ in the regime described in Theorem 7: (29), (30) and (31).*

(Soliton) *The solution is global, for all $t \geq 0$, $u(t) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}$, and there exist $\lambda_\infty > 0$ and $x(t)$ such that*

$$\lambda_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}} u(t, \lambda_\infty \cdot + x(t)) \to Q \quad \text{in } H^1_{\mathrm{loc}} \text{ as } t \to +\infty, \tag{36}$$

$$|\lambda_\infty - 1| \leq o_{\alpha_0 \to 0}(1), \quad x(t) \sim \frac{t}{\lambda_\infty^2} \quad \text{as} \quad t \to +\infty. \tag{37}$$

(Exit) *There exists $t^* \in (0,T)$ such that $u(t^*) \notin \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}$. Let $t_u^* \gg 1$ be the corresponding exit time*

$$t_u^* = \sup\{0 < t < T; \text{ such that } \forall t' \in [0,t],\ u(t) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\}. \tag{38}$$

Then there exist $\tau^* = \tau^*(\alpha^*)$ (independent of u) and (λ_u^*, x_u^*) such that

$$\left\| (\lambda_u^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} u\left(t_u^*, \lambda_u^* x + x_u^*\right) - S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(\tau^*, x) \right\|_{L^2} \leq \delta(\alpha_0),$$

where $\delta(\alpha_0) \to 0$ as $\alpha_0 \to 0$.

Theorem 9 classifies the possible behaviors of solutions with initial data in $\mathcal{A}$, including a certain description of the long time dynamics in the (Exit) regime. This question happens to be deeply related to the minimal mass dynamics, which is an unexpected new phenomenon. Indeed, any (Exit) solution at its exit time is close to a universal profile $S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(\tau^*)$, up to a large defocusing scaling $\lambda_u^* \gg 1$, premise of a dispersive behavior. In view of the universality of S_{KdV} as a attractor to all exiting solutions, and in continuation of Theorem 9, it is thus an important open problem to understand the behavior of $S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(t)$ as $t \to +\infty$. For the mass critical (NLS), $S_{\mathrm{NLS}}(t)$ scatters as $t \to \infty$. Scattering of $S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(t)$ as $t \to +\infty$ is an open problem[2]. We conjecture that $S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(t)$ actually scatters, and because scattering is an open property in L^2 (see [24]), we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1 ([40]). *Assume that $S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(t)$ scatters as $t \to +\infty$. Then, any solution in the* (Exit) *scenario is global for positive time and scatters as $t \to +\infty$.*

Related rigidity theorems near solitary waves were also obtained by Nakanishi and Schlag [55, 56] and Krieger, Nakanishi and Schlag [28], for super critical wave and Schrödinger equations using the invariant set methods of Beresticky and Cazenave [3], Kenig-Merle concentration compactness approach [25], the classification of minimal dynamics [13, 14], and a further "no return" lemma in the (Exit) regime. In the (Exit) regime, this lemma shows that the solution cannot come back close to solitons and in fact scatters. (In critical situations, such an analysis is more delicate and incomplete, see [28].) Both the blow up statements and the no return lemma in [55, 56], rely on a specific algebraic structure - the virial identity - which does not exist for (gKdV). The above results for (gKdV) rely on the explicit computation of the

[2]by scattering for (gKdV), we mean that there exists a solution $v(t,x)$ to the Airy equation $\partial_t v + v_{xxx} = 0$ such that $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \|S_{\mathrm{KdV}}(t) - v(t)\|_{L^2} = 0$.

solution in the various regimes, and not on algebraic virial type identities. Indeed introducing the decomposition (27), one shows that at the leading order, $\lambda(t)$ satisfies

$$\lambda_{tt} = 0, \quad \lambda(0) = 1. \tag{39}$$

Roughly speaking, the three regimes (Exit), (Blow up), (Soliton) correspond respectively to $\lambda_t(0) > 0$, $\lambda_t(0) < 0$ and the threshold dynamic $\lambda_t(0) = 0$, see next section for details.

Now we produce a wide range of different blow up rates, including grow up in infinite time, for initial data $u_0 \notin \mathcal{A}$ having slow decay on the right. In particular, the blow up rate $\frac{1}{(T-t)}$ is universal in $\mathcal{A}$ as a consequence of the leading order ODE (39) which can be justified only under the decay assumption $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. The tail of slowly decaying data can interact with the solitary wave which is moving to the right, which lead in some cases to new exotic singular regimes.

Theorem 10 (Exotic blow up rates, [41])**.**
(i) Blow up in finite time: *for any* $\nu > \frac{11}{13}$*, there exists* $u \in C((0,T_0),H^1)$ *solution of* (2) *blowing up at* $t = 0$ *with*

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \sim t^{-\nu} \quad as \quad t \to 0^+. \tag{40}$$

(ii) Grow up in infinite time: *there exists* $u \in C([T_0,+\infty),H^1)$ *solution of* (2) *growing up at* $+\infty$ *with*

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \sim e^t \quad as \quad t \to +\infty. \tag{41}$$

For any $\nu > 0$*, there exists* $u \in C([T_0,+\infty),H^1)$ *solution of* (2) *growing up at* $+\infty$ *with*

$$\|u_x(t)\|_{L^2} \sim t^{\nu} \quad as \quad t \to +\infty. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, such solutions can be taken arbitrarily close in H^1 *to solitons.*

It follows from the proof of Theorem 10 that the grow up rate is directly related to the peculiar behavior of the initial data on the right. In particular, other types of blow up speeds can be produced by changing the tail of the initial data. A similar phenomenon was observed for global in time growing up solutions to the energy critical harmonic heat flow by Gustafson, Nakanishi and Tsai [19]. In [19], an explicit formula on the growth of the solution at infinity is given directly in terms of the initial data. Continuums of blow up rates were also observed in pioneering works by Krieger, Schlag and Tataru [30, 31] for energy critical wave problems, see also Donninger and Krieger [10]. We also refer to stability [2] and finite time blow up [51] results for the energy critical Schrödinger map problem. All these results point out that the critical topology is not enough by itself to classify the flow near the ground state.

4. An overview of the classification of the flow for (gKdV)

Our aim in this section is to give a simple overview of the proof of the classification theorems for the (gKdV) flow, and in particular the rigidity property formally stated in (39) which readily leads to the three scenarios in Theorem 9.

Notation. Let

$$Lf = -f'' + f - 5Q^4 f \tag{43}$$

be the linearized operator close to Q. We note the rescaling operator:

$$f^\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}} f\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)$$

and introduce the generator of L^2 scaling:

$$\Lambda f = -\frac{\partial f^\lambda}{\partial \lambda}_{|\lambda=1} = \frac{1}{2} f + y f'.$$

The L^2 scalar product is denoted by $(f,g) = \int fg dx$.

4.1. **The approximate blow up profile.** The starting point of the analysis is to understand the leading order profile of the solution. The knowledge of the instability directions of the flow near Q is essential and adjustments of these directions lead to the scenarios of Theorem 9. Let us look for a solution to (gKdV) in the form of a renormalized bubble

$$u(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)} v\left(s, \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)}\right), \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda^3} \tag{44}$$

which leads to the evolution equation:

$$\partial_s v + (v_{yy} - v + v^5)_y + \left(\frac{x_s}{\lambda} - 1\right) v_y - \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \Lambda v = 0.$$

We freeze the modulation equations

$$\frac{x_s}{\lambda} - 1 = 0, \quad -\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} = b \tag{45}$$

and we follow the strategy of construction of blow up solutions initiated in [46], [62], [66], looking for a slowly modulated profile

$$v(s,y) = Q_{b(s)}(y), \quad Q_b = Q + bP_1 + b^2 P_2 + \dots.$$

The problem writes: how can we choose the law of the parameter b to ensure the solvability of the system satisfied by $(P_i)_{i\geq 1}$? We proceed the expansion

$$b_s = -c_2 b^2 - c_3 b^3 + \dots, \quad Q_b = Q + bP_1 + b^2 P_2 + \dots, \quad v(s,y) = Q_{b(s)}(y)$$

and aim at solving the following system by expanding in powers of b

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_s v + (v_{yy} - v + v^5)_y + \left(\frac{x_s}{\lambda} - 1\right) v_y - \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \Lambda v \\ &= b_s \frac{\partial Q_b}{\partial b} + ((Q_b)_{yy} - Q_b + Q_b^5)_y + b \Lambda Q_b. \end{aligned}$$

- Order $O(1)$ corresponds to the solitary wave equation:

$$(Q_{yy} - Q + Q^5)_y = 0.$$

- Order $O(b)$ provides the equation

$$\Lambda Q + (LP_1)' = 0 \tag{46}$$

where L is given by (43). The translation invariance induces the existence of a (unique by ODE techniques) non trivial element of the kernel: $LQ' = 0$. Hence solvability of (46) requires the cancellation

$$(\Lambda Q, Q) = 0$$

which indeed holds as a direct consequence of the L^2 critical invariance of the problem. However since $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \Lambda Q \neq 0$, solving (46) induces a non trivial growth of the solution P_1 to the right or to the left. Choose P_1 the unique solution to (46) which is exponentially well localized on the right $y \to +\infty$, but behaves like a non zero constant as $y \to -\infty$.

- Order $O(b^2)$: we obtain an equation of the form

$$-c_2 P_1 + (LP_2 + N(P_1))' = 0$$

where $N(P_1)$ is some explicit nonlinear term. The solvability condition

$$(-c_2 P_1 + (N(P_1))', Q) = 0$$

leads after some computations to the choice

$$c_2 = 2.$$

Therefore, at the formal level, we obtain the following *universal* dynamical system driving the geometrical parameters:

$$b_s = -2b^2, \quad b = -\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}, \quad \frac{x_s}{\lambda} = 1, \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda^3}, \tag{47}$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\lambda_{tt} = 0, \quad x_t = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}, \quad b = -\lambda^2 \lambda_t. \tag{48}$$

By scaling invariance, we may always choose $\lambda(0) = 1$, and then the phase portrait of (48) is

- if $b(0) := b_0 < 0$, then $\lambda(t) = 1 - b_0 t \to +\infty$ as $t \to +\infty$.
- if $b_0 = 0$, then $\lambda(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$.
- if $b_0 > 0$, then $\lambda(t) = 1 - b_0 t$ vanishes at $T = \frac{1}{b_0}$ and $\lambda(t) = b_0(T - t)$, integrating from T.

The analysis is now reduced to show that for initial data in $\mathcal{A}$, the above dynamical system governs the leading order solitonic part of the solution, so that the three regimes of Theorem 9 correspond to perturbations of the above three cases. Like for the finite dimensional system (48), the first and third regimes are stable, the second one is the unstable threshold dynamics.

4.2. **Nonlinear decomposition of the flow.** A solution $u(t,x)$ of (2) close in H^1 to a soliton is decomposed as

$$u(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)} (Q_{b(t)} + \varepsilon)(s,y), \quad y = \frac{x - x(t)}{\lambda(t)}, \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda^3(t)}$$

where (s,y) are the renormalized space time variables. The parameters $(b(t), \lambda(t), x(t))$ which describe the drift along the soliton family are uniquely adjusted to obtain orthogonality conditions on ε for all time:

$$(\varepsilon, Q) = (\varepsilon, \Lambda Q) = (\varepsilon, y \Lambda Q) = 0. \tag{49}$$

This choice of orhogonality conditions is justified by Lemma 11 below. The renormalized flow for ε becomes:

$$\varepsilon_s - (L\varepsilon)_y = \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b \right) \Lambda Q + \left(\frac{x_s}{\lambda} - 1 \right) Q' + \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \Lambda \varepsilon + O\left(b^2 + |b_s| + |\varepsilon|^2 \right). \tag{50}$$

The dynamical system driving (b, λ, x) is obtained from this equation and (49). With respect to the idealized system (47), it contains additional perturbation terms coming from b^2, b_s

and ε. Typically, the construction of Q_b and the decay assumption on the initial data (it is necessary at this point) ensure a bound of the form:

$$|b_s + 2b^2| + \left|\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right| \lesssim \int |\varepsilon|^2 e^{-|y|} + O(b^3). \tag{51}$$

The remaining point to justify the dynamics is to obtain a uniform control of $\varepsilon(s)$ in suitable norms whose choice is essential.

Neglecting for the moment second order and higher order terms in the equation of ε, we concentrate on a toy model:

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_s - (L\widetilde{\varepsilon})_y = \alpha(s)\Lambda Q + \beta(s)Q' \tag{52}$$

for which the following monotonicity formula can be proved:

Lemma 11. *Let $\widetilde{\varepsilon}(s,y)$ be a solution of (52) satisfying the orthogonality conditions (49). Then,*

(1) *Energy conservation at $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$ level:*

$$\forall s, \quad (L\widetilde{\varepsilon}(s), \widetilde{\varepsilon}(s)) = (L\widetilde{\varepsilon}(0), \widetilde{\varepsilon}(0)). \tag{53}$$

(2) *Virial estimate*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int y\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 = -H(\widetilde{\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\varepsilon}), \tag{54}$$

where

$$H(\widetilde{\varepsilon}, \widetilde{\varepsilon}) = \int \left(3\widetilde{\varepsilon}_y^2 + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 - 5Q^4\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 + 20yQ'Q^3\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\right) \geq \mu_0\|\widetilde{\varepsilon}(s)\|_{H^1}^2. \tag{55}$$

(3) *Mixed Virial and energy-monotonicity estimate: for $B \gg 1$, $\mu_1 > 0$,*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left[\int \widetilde{\varepsilon}_y^2\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\varphi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) - 5Q^4\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right)\right] + \mu_1\int\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon}_y^2 + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\right)\varphi'\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) \leq 0, \tag{56}$$

$$\int \widetilde{\varepsilon}_y^2\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\varphi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) - 5Q^4\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) \geq \mu_1\int \widetilde{\varepsilon}_y^2\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2\varphi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right), \tag{57}$$

where the smooth functions φ and ψ satisfy

$$\varphi(y) = \begin{cases} e^y \text{ for } y < -1, \\ 1 + y \text{ for } -\frac{1}{2} < y < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \varphi' \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}, \\ y \text{ for } y > 1, \end{cases} \tag{58}$$

$$\psi(y) = \begin{cases} e^{2y} \text{ for } y < -1, \\ 1 \text{ for } y > -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \psi' \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \tag{59}$$

Proof. Identities (53) and (54) are obtained by direct computations from the equation of ε and classical properties of L (see [70]). The coercivity of $H(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)$ is proved in [34]. Estimate (56) follows from direct computations and estimates, and (55) applied to a suitable localization of ε. It combines in a sharp way monotonicity arguments from [34] (reminiscent of the Kato smoothing effect [22]) and localized Virial estimates. The coercivity property (57) is a consequence of well-known properties of the operator L: for $\mu > 0$,

$$(\varepsilon, Q) = (\varepsilon, y\Lambda Q) = (\varepsilon, \Lambda Q) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad (L\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \geq \mu\|\varepsilon\|_{H^1}^2,$$

(see [70]), and localization arguments. □

4.3. **The energy/virial Lyapunov functional.** The mixed energy-Morawetz estimate (56) provides both a pointwise control of the boundary term and a space time control of some local norm. At the nonlinear level, this kind of tools may be delicate to handle due to localization in space, the main difficulty being to control the nonlinear terms using the sole weighted norms present in (56). This is a well-known problem, and the choice of the weights (φ, ψ) is here essential. The presence of the drift operator $\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\varepsilon$ in the right-hand side of (50) is an additional difficulty for space localization, which requires the assumption of space decay on the right, i.e. $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. For blow up problems, such a strategy based on mixed energy-virial estimates to control the residual term ε was already used in [62], [66] but in a setting where localization in space is simpler to handle. For (gKdV), the strategy developed in [39] goes as follows.

For $B \gg 1$ fixed, define the weighted norms

$$\mathcal{N}(s) = \int \varepsilon_y^2 \psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) + \varepsilon^2 \varphi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right),$$

and the nonlinear functional:

$$\mathcal{F}_i(s) = \int \varepsilon_y^2 \psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) + \varepsilon^2(1+\mathcal{J}_i)\varphi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) - \frac{1}{3}\left((\varepsilon+Q_b)^6 - Q_b^6 - 6\varepsilon Q_b^5\right)\psi\left(\frac{y}{B}\right),$$

where we introduced the following nonlinear lower order corrections[3]

$$\mathcal{J}_i = (1-J_1)^{-4i} - 1, \quad J_1 = (\varepsilon, \rho_1), \quad \rho_1(y) = \frac{4}{\left(\int Q\right)^2}\int_{-\infty}^{y} \Lambda Q.$$

Then, we obtain the following Lyapunov monotonicity which takes the form of a bootstrap bound[4]:

Proposition 12 ([39]). *Assume on some interval* $[0, s_0]$,
(H1) smallness:

$$\|\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2} + |b(s)| + \mathcal{N}(s) \le \kappa^*; \tag{60}$$

(H2) comparison between b and λ:

$$\frac{|b(s)| + \mathcal{N}(s)}{\lambda^2(s)} \le \kappa^*; \tag{61}$$

(H3) L^2 weighted bound on the right:

$$\int_{y>0} y^{10}\varepsilon^2(s,x)dx \le 10\left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda^{10}(s)}\right). \tag{62}$$

Then the following bounds hold on $[0, s_0]$*: for* $B \gg 1$, $\mu > 0$,
(i) Scaling invariant Lyapunov control:

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{F}_1 + \mu\int \left(\varepsilon_y^2 + \varepsilon^2\right)\varphi'\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) \lesssim |b|^4. \tag{63}$$

(ii) Scaling weighted H^1 Lyapunov control:

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left\{\frac{\mathcal{F}_2}{\lambda^2}\right\} + \frac{\mu}{\lambda^2}\int \left(\varepsilon_y^2 + \varepsilon^2\right)\varphi'\left(\frac{y}{B}\right) \lesssim \frac{|b|^4}{\lambda^2}. \tag{64}$$

[3] which should be ignored at first hand.
[4] in order to control the nonlinear term.

(iii) Pointwise bounds:

$$|J_1| + |J_2| \lesssim \mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{65}$$
$$\mathcal{N} \lesssim \mathcal{F}_j \lesssim \mathcal{N}, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

4.4. **Rigidity and selection of the dynamics.** Note that estimate (64) controls the radiation ε independently of the dynamics and thus is valid in all possible regimes like (Blow up), (Soliton) or (Exit). In particular, estimate (64) completely reduces the control of ε to the sole control of the parameter b. Combining this estimate with the finite dimensional evolution equation (51) leads to the following rigidity formula for b:

Lemma 13 (Control of the dynamics for b, [39]). *Under assumptions* (H1)-(H2)-(H3) *of Proposition 12, for all* $0 \le s_1 \le s_2 < s_0$,

$$\left| \frac{b(s_2)}{\lambda^2(s_2)} - \frac{b(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)} \right| \le \frac{C^*}{10} \left[\frac{b^2(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)} + \frac{b^2(s_2)}{\lambda^2(s_2)} + \frac{\mathcal{N}(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)} \right] \tag{66}$$

for some universal constant $C^* > 0$.

The three scenarios of Theorem 9 are a direct consequence of (66). Indeed, there are only two possibilities.

- Either there exists a time s_1 such that at s_1, $|b(s_1)|$ dominates ε in the sense that

$$\frac{|b(s_1)|}{\lambda^2(s_1)} \gg \frac{\mathcal{N}(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)}. \tag{67}$$

Then from (66) and the a priori bound (60)-(61), this property is propagated at later times and:

$$\forall s_2 \ge s_1, \quad \frac{b(s_2)}{\lambda^2(s_2)} \sim \frac{b(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)} = c_0 \neq 0.$$

Thus, from (51):

$$\frac{b}{\lambda^2} \sim \frac{-\lambda_s}{\lambda^3} = -\lambda_t \sim c_0.$$

If $c_0 > 0$, λ vanishes in finite time T, $\lambda(t) \sim c_0(T-t)$ and this corresponds to (Blow up). If $c_0 < 0$, λ is growing and so is b so that $u(t)$ is moving away in L^2 from the solitary wave, which is the (Exit) case. Observe that (67) is an open condition on the data, and hence both these regimes are stable.

- Or this time s_1 does not exist, which means that

$$\forall s_1, \quad \frac{|b(s_1)|}{\lambda^2(s_1)} \ll \frac{\mathcal{N}(s_1)}{\lambda^2(s_1)} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad |b(s_1)| \lesssim \mathcal{N}(s_1).$$

Then the space time bounds on ε eventually lead to the following estimate

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \left| \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \right| \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} |b(s)| ds \lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{N}(s) ds < +\infty$$

and thus

$$\lambda(s) \to \lambda_\infty > 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s \to +\infty.$$

This is the (Soliton) dynamics which is a threshold regime.

4.5. **Construction of the minimal mass blow up solution.** The construction of the minimal mass solution and the determination of the universal behavior of solutions in the (Exit) regime follow the same compactness strategy. The minimal blow up solution in Theorem 8 is obtained as the limit of sequences of *defocusing* solutions. Indeed, we pick a sequence of *well-prepared* initial data

$$u_n(0) = Q_{b_n(0)}, \quad b_n(0) = -\frac{1}{n}$$

which by construction have subcritical mass

$$\|u_n(0)\|_{L^2} - \|Q\|_{L^2} \sim \frac{c}{n}.$$

Such solutions are necessarily in the (Exit) regime of Theorem 9 and we denote by t_n^* the corresponding exit time. Moreover, we have from [39] (see also the formal discussion of Section 3) a precise description of the flow in the time interval $[0, t_n^*]$; in particular, we know that the solution admits a decomposition

$$u_n(t,x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)}(Q_{b_n(t)} + \varepsilon_n)\left(t, \frac{x - x_n(t)}{\lambda_n(t)}\right) \tag{68}$$

where, at the leading order, (b_n, λ_n) behaves as follows

$$\frac{b_n(t)}{\lambda_n^2(t)} \sim b_n(0) = -\frac{1}{n}, \quad (\lambda_n)_t \sim -b_n(0),$$

$$\lambda_n(t) \sim 1 - b_n(0)t, \quad b_n(t) \sim b_n(0)\lambda_n^2(t). \tag{69}$$

The (Exit) time t_n^* is the one for which the solution moves strictly away from the solitary wave which in our setting is equivalent to

$$b_n(t_n^*) \sim -\alpha^*,$$

with α^* independent of n. This allows us to compute t_n^* and show using (69) that the solution defocuses:

$$\lambda_n^2(t_n^*) \sim \frac{b_n(t_n^*)}{b_n(0)} \sim n\alpha^* \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty.$$

Next, we renormalize the flow at t_n^*, considering the solution of (gKdV) defined by

$$v_n(\tau, x) = \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}(t_n^*) u_n(t_\tau, \lambda_n(t_n^*)x + x_n(t_n^*)), \quad t_\tau = t_n^* + \tau\lambda_n^3(t_n^*).$$

From direct computations, v_n admits a decomposition

$$v_n(\tau, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{v_n}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tau)}(Q_{b_{v_n}} + \varepsilon_{v_n})\left(\tau, \frac{x - x_{v_n(\tau)}}{\lambda_{v_n(\tau)}}\right)$$

with from the symmetries of the flow

$$\lambda_{v_n}(\tau) = \frac{\lambda_n(t_\tau)}{\lambda_n(t_n^*)}, \quad x_{v_n}(\tau) = \frac{x_n(t_\tau) - x_n(t_n)}{\lambda_n(t_n^*)}, \quad b_{v_n}(\tau) = b_n(t_\tau), \quad \varepsilon_{v_n}(\tau) = \varepsilon_n(t_\tau).$$

The renormalized parameters can be computed at the main order using (69):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{v_n}(\tau) &\sim \frac{1}{\lambda_n(t_n^*)}\left[1 - b_n(0)(t_n^* + \tau\lambda_n^3(t_n^*))\right] \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\lambda_n(t_n^*)}\left[\lambda_n(t_n^*) - \tau b_n(0)\lambda_n^3(t_n^*)\right] \sim 1 - \tau b_n(t_n^*) \sim 1 + \tau\alpha^*. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the law of $\lambda_{v_n}(\tau)$ at this order does not depend on n, which is a remarkable and decisive property in this approach. Letting $n \to +\infty$, we extract a weak limit in H^1 $v_n(0) \rightharpoonup v(0)$ such that the corresponding solution $v(\tau)$ to (gKdV) blows up backwards at some finite time $\tau^* \sim -\frac{1}{\alpha^*}$ with the blow up speed $\lambda_v(\tau) \sim \tau - \tau^*$ as expected. Note that the extraction of the weak limit requires uniform estimates on the residual radiation ε_{v_n}. Here it is essential that the set of data $u_n(0)$ is *well-prepared*, as this implies uniform bounds for $\varepsilon_{v_n}(0) = \varepsilon_{u_n}(t_n^*)$ in H^1 and allows us to use the H^1 weak continuity of the flow in the limiting process. Finally, by the weak convergence, one obtains $\|v\|_{L^2} \leq \|Q\|_{L^2}$, but since the solution $v(\tau)$ blows up in finite time, $\|v\|_{L^2} = \|Q\|_{L^2}$.

For uniqueness, we refer the reader to [40].

4.6. **Solutions in the (Exit) regime.** Now, we prove the universality of S_{KdV} as an attractor in the (Exit) case. For this, we consider a sequence of data $(u_0)_n$ with $\|(u_0)_n\|_{L^2} \to \|Q\|_{L^2}$ as $n \to +\infty$ such that the corresponding solution to (gKdV) is in the (Exit) regime. We write the solution at the (Exit) time in the form (68), renormalize the flow and aim at extracting a weak limit as $n \to +\infty$ as before. The strategy of the proof is similar to the construction of the minimal mass solution, except that since the data is not well-prepared, no uniform H^1 bound on $v_n(0)$ can be obtained. To get around, we use two additional ingredients:

(1) a concentration compactness argument on sequences of solutions in the critical L^2 space in the spirit of [25] using the tools developed in [68] and [26] for the Airy group. This allows us to extract a non trivial weak limit with suitable dynamical controls;
(2) refined *local* H^1 bounds on $v_n(\tau)$ in order to ensure that the L^2 limit of this sequence actually belongs to H^1.

Hence the weak limit is a minimal mass H^1 blow up element, and by the uniqueness statement of Theorem 8, the limit is S_{KdV} up to the symmetries of the equation, which provides the final conclusion of Theorem 9.

References

[1] Banica, V.; Carles, R.; Duyckaerts, T., Minimal blow-up solutions to the mass-critical inhomogeneous focusing NLS equation. Comm. P.D.E. **36** (2011), no. 3, 487-531

[2] I. Bejenaru; D. Tataru, Near soliton evolution for equivariant Schroedinger Maps in two spatial dimensions, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 228, no. 1069, 2014, 108pp.; 2010,95pp.,arXiv:1009.1608.

[3] Berestycki, H.; Cazenave, T., Instabilité des états stationnaires dans les équations de Schrödinger et de Klein-Gordon non linéaires. (French. English summary) [Instability of stationary states in nonlinear Schrödinger and Klein-Gordon equations] C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 293 (1981), no. 9, 489–492.

[4] Blanchet, A.; Carrillo, J.A.; Masmoudi, N., Infinite time aggregation for the critical Patlak-Keller-Segel model in $\mathbb{R}^2$, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 61 (2008), no. 10, 1449–ĂŞ1481.

[5] T. Boulenger, Explosion pour NLS sur une variété, Thèse de l'Université de Paris XI (2012).

[6] J. Bourgain and W. Wang, Construction of blowup solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 25 (1997), 197–215 (1998).

[7] Cazenave, Th.; Weissler, F., Some remarks on the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the critical case. Nonlinear semigroups, partial differential equations and attractors (Washington, DC, 1987), 18–29, Lecture Notes in Math., 1394, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[8] Cazenave, Th.; Semilinear Schrödinger equations, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 10, NYU, CIMS, AMS 2003.

[9] Dodson, B., Global well-posedness and scattering for the mass critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with mass below the mass of the ground state, arXiv:1104.1114 (2011)

[10] Donninger, R.; Krieger, J., Nonscattering solutions and blowup at infinity for the critical wave equation, Math. Ann. 357:1 (2013), 89–163; 2012 (v3 – 2013), 53 pp., arXiv: 1201.3258.
[11] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle, Universality of the blow-up profile for small type II blow-up solutions of energy-critical wave equation, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 14:5 (2012), 1389?1454.
[12] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle, Classification of radial solutions of the focusing, energy-critical wave equation, preprint 2012, 47 pp., arXiv: 1204.0031.
[13] T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle, Dynamics of threshold solutions for energy-critical wave equation. Int. Math. Res. Pap. IRMP, Art. ID rpn002, 67 pp. (2008).
[14] T. Duyckaerts and F. Merle, Dynamic of threshold solutions for energy-critical NLS, Geom. Funct. Anal. 18 (2009), 1787–1840.
[15] G. Fibich, F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Proof of a spectral property related to the singularity formation for the L2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Phys. D **220** (2006), 1–13.
[16] Fibich, G.; Gavish, N.; Wang, X-P., Singular ring solutions of critical and supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Phys. D 231 (2007), no. 1, 55–86.
[17] Ginibre, J.; Velo, G., On a class of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. I. The Cauchy problem, general case, J. Funct. Anal. 32 (1979), no. 1, 1–32.
[18] Glangetas, L.; Merle, F., Existence of self-similar blow-up solutions for Zakharov equation in dimension two. I. Comm. Math. Phys. 160 (1994), no. 1, 173–215.
[19] S. Gustafson, K. Nakanishi and T.-P. Tsai, Asymptotic stability, concentration and oscillations in harmonic map heat flow, Landau Lifschitz and Schrödinger maps on $\mathbb{R}^2$, Comm. Math. Phys. **300** (2010), 205-242.
[20] Holmer, J., Roudenko, S., A class of solutions to the 3d cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation that blow-up on a circle, Appl. Math. Res. Express AMRX, (2011), no. 1, 23-94.
[21] Holmer, J., Roudenko, S., Blow-up solutions on a sphere for the 3d quintic NLS in the energy space, Analysis and PDE 5-3 (2012), pp. 475–512.
[22] T. Kato, On the Cauchy problem for the (generalized) Korteweg-de Vries equation. Studies in applied mathematics, 93–128, Adv. Math. Suppl. Stud., 8, Academic Press, New York, 1983.
[23] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized Korteweg–de Vries equation via the contraction principle, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46**, (1993) 527–620.
[24] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, On the concentration of blow up solutions for the generalized KdV equation critical in L^2. Nonlinear wave equations (Providence, RI, 1998), 131–156, Contemp. Math., **263**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
[25] C.E. Kenig, F. Merle, Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. Invent. Math. **166** (2006) 645–675.
[26] R. Killip, S. Kwon, S. Shao, M. Visan, On the mass-critical generalized KdV equation. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **32** (2012), 191–221.
[27] Krieger, J.; Lenzmann, E.; Raphaël, P., Nondispersive solutions to the L^2-critical half-wave equation,Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 209:1 (2013), 61–129; 2012, 51 pp., arXiv: 1203.2476.
[28] J. Krieger, K. Nakanishi and W. Schlag, Global dynamics away from the ground state for the energy-critical nonlinear wave equation, Amer. J. Math. 135:4 (2013), 935–965; 2010,26pp.,arXiv:1010.3799.
[29] J. Krieger and W. Schlag, Non-generic blow-up solutions for the critical focusing NLS in 1-D, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **11** (2009), 1–125.
[30] J. Krieger, W. Schlag and D. Tataru, Renormalization and blow up for charge one equivariant critical wave maps. Invent. Math. **171** (2008), 543–615.
[31] J. Krieger, W. Schlag and D. Tataru, Slow blow-up solutions for the $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ critical focusing semilinear wave equation, Duke Math. J. **147** (2009), 1–53.
[32] M. J. Landman, G. C. Papanicolaou, C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem, Rate of blowup for solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation at critical dimension. Phys. Rev. A (3) **38** (1988), 3837–3843.
[33] Lions, P.-L.; The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The locally compact case. I. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 1 (1984), no. 2, 109–145.
[34] Y. Martel and F. Merle, A Liouville theorem for the critical generalized Korteweg–de Vries equation, J. Math. Pures Appl. **79** (2000), 339–425.
[35] Y. Martel and F. Merle, Instability of solitons for the critical generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation. Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), 74–123.
[36] Y. Martel and F. Merle, Stability of blow up profile and lower bounds for blow up rate for the critical generalized KdV equation, Ann. of Math. **155** (2002), 235–280.

[37] Y. Martel and F. Merle, Blow up in finite time and dynamics of blow up solutions for the L^2-critical generalized KdV equation, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), 617–664.
[38] Y. Martel and F. Merle, Frank Nonexistence of blow-up solution with minimal L^2-mass for the critical gKdV equation. Duke Math. J. **115** (2002), 385–408.
[39] Y. Martel, F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Blow up for the critical gKdV equation I: dynamics near the soliton ; 2012, 66 pp., arXiv: 1204.4625.
[40] Y. Martel, F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Blow up for the critical gKdV equation II: minimal mass solution ; 2012, 59 pp., arXiv: 1204.4624.
[41] Y. Martel, F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Blow up for the critical gKdV equation III: exotic blow up rates ; 2012, 44 pp., arXiv: 1209.2510.
[42] F. Merle, Determination of blow-up solutions with minimal mass for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with critical power, Duke Math. J. **69** (1993), 427–454.
[43] F. Merle, Nonexistence of minimal blow-up solutions of equations $iu_t = -\Delta u - k(x)u^{4/N}u$ in R^N, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaé Phys. Théor. 64 (1996), no. 1, 33–85.
[44] Merle, F., Lower bounds for the blow up rate of solutions of the Zakharov equations in dimension two, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. 49 (1996), n0. 8, 765-794.
[45] F. Merle, Existence of blow-up solutions in the energy space for the critical generalized KdV equation. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), 555–578.
[46] F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Sharp upper bound on the blow up rate for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Geom. Func. Anal. **13** (2003), 591–642.
[47] F. Merle and P. Raphaël, On universality of blow-up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Invent. Math. **156** (2004), 565–672.
[48] F. Merle and P. Raphaël, The blow up dynamics and upper bound on the blow up rate for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Ann. of Math. **161** (2005), 157–222.
[49] F. Merle and P. Raphaël, Profiles and quantization of the blow up mass for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Commun. Math. Phys. **253** (2005), 675–704.
[50] F. Merle and P. Raphaël, On a sharp lower bound on the blow-up rate for the L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (2006), 37–90.
[51] F. Merle, P. Raphaël and I. Rodnianski, Blow up dynamics for smooth data equivariant solutions to the energy critical Schrodinger map problem, 2011, 8 pp., arXiv:1102.4308; Invent.Math.(to appear).
[52] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Szeftel, J., Stable self similar blow up dynamics for slightly L^2 supercritical NLS equations. Geom. Funct. Anal., 20 (2010), 1028-1071.
[53] F. Merle, P. Raphaël and J. Szeftel, The instability of Bourgain-Wang solutions for the L^2 critical NLS, to appear in Amer. Math. Jour., preprint arXiv:1010.5168.
[54] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Szeftel, J., On collapsing ring blow up solutions to the mass supercritical NLS, arXiv:1202.5218 (2012)
[55] K. Nakanishi and W. Schlag, Global dynamics above the ground state energy for the focusing nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation, J. Differential Equations **250** (2011), 2299–2333.
[56] K. Nakanishi and W. Schlag, Global dynamics above the ground state energy for the cubic NLS equation in 3D, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 44:1-2 (2012), 1–45; 2010 (v2 – 2011), 47 pp., arXiv: 1007.4025.
[57] Papanicolaou, G. C.; Sulem, C.; Sulem, P.-L.; Wang, X. P., Singular solutions of the Zakharov equations for Langmuir turbulence. Phys. Fluids B 3 (1991), no. 4, 969–980.
[58] G. Perelman, On the formation of singularities in solutions of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Ann. Henri Poincaré **2** (2001), 605–673.
[59] P. Raphaël, Stability of the log-log bound for blow up solutions to the critical non linear Schrödinger equation. Math. Ann. **331** (2005), 577–609.
[60] Raphaël, P., Existence and stability of a solution blowing up on a sphere for a L^2 supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Duke Math. J. 134 (2006), no. 2, 199-258.
[61] P. Raphaël, Stability and blow up for the nonlinear Schrodinger equation, Lecture notes for the Clay summer school on evolution equations, ETH, Zurich (2008), http://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/∼raphael/Teaching.html
[62] P. Raphaël and I. Rodnianski, Stable blow up dynamics for the critical co-rotational Wave Maps and equivariant Yang-Mills problems. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. 115:1 (2012), 1–122; 2009, 89 pp., arXiv: 0911.0692.

[63] P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer, Stable blow up dynamics for the 1-corotational harmonic heat flow, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 66:3 (2013), 414–480.
[64] P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer, Slow blow up solutions for the 1-corotational harmonic heat flow, in preparation.
[65] Raphaël, P., Szeftel, J., Standing ring blow up solutions to the N-dimensional quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **290** (3), 973-996, 2009.
[66] P. Raphaël and J. Szeftel, Existence and uniqueness of minimal blow up solutions to an inhomogeneous mass critical NLS. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **24**, 471-546 (2011).
[67] I. Rodnianski, J. Sterbenz, On the formation of singularities in the critical $O(3)$ σ-model, Ann. of Math. (2) **172** (2010), 187–242.
[68] S. Shao, The linear profile decomposition for the Airy equation and the existence of maximizers for the Airy Strichartz inequality. Anal. PDE **2** (2009), 83–117.
[69] Sulem, C.; Sulem, P.L., The nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Self-focusing and wave collapse. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 139. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
[70] M.I. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation estimates, Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1983), 567–576.
[71] Zakharov, V.E.; Shabat, A.B., Exact theory of two-dimensional self-focusing and one-dimensional self-modulation of waves in non-linear media, Sov. Phys. JETP **34** (1972), 62–69.
[72] Zwiers, Y., Blow up of supercritical NLS on a ring, to appear in Analysis and PDE.

Ecole Polytechnique, CMLS UMR7640
E-mail address: yvan.martel@polytechnique.edu

Université de Cergy Pontoise and Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, AGM CNRS UMR8088
E-mail address: merle@math.u-cergy.fr

Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis and Institut Universitaire de France, LJAD CNRS UMR7361
E-mail address: praphael@unice.fr

CNRS and Université Pierre et Marie Curie , LJLL UMR7598
E-mail address: jeremie.szeftel@upmc.fr